

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated August 13, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 13, 2003. Claims 30-44 and 59-70 are pending in this application and are shown above. Claim 59 was rejected by the Examiner. Claims 30-44 and 60-70 are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claim is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Avanzino et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,184,141) further in view of *Chopra* (U.S. Patent 6,276,996). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the process of *Avanzino et al.* with the composition, process and apparatus of the fixed abrasive linear belt as taught by *Chopra*. Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection of claim 59 as amended to clarify the claimed subject matter.

Avanzino et al. discloses polishing with an abrasive slurry at a first removal rate and a second removal rate slower than the first rate by modifying mechanical processing conditions. *Chopra* discloses abrasive-free compositions adapted for polishing substrates with fixed-abrasive polishing pads. Neither reference suggests increasing inhibitor concentrations during polishing of the substrate. Therefore, the combination of *Avanzino et al.* and *Chopra* does not teach, show, or suggest a method of planarizing a wafer surface, comprising removing a portion of a copper containing material with a first polishing composition at a first removal rate, wherein the first polishing composition comprises a first inhibitor concentration between about 0.05 wt.% to about 0.2 wt.% of an inhibitor and selectively removing a copper containing material with a second polishing composition at a second removal rate less than the first removal rate, wherein the second polishing composition comprises a second inhibitor concentration greater than the first inhibitor concentration, wherein the second inhibitor concentration is between about 0.5 wt.% to about 1.0 wt.% of the inhibitor, as recited in claim 59. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the

primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the methods of the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Agent for Applicant(s)

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 15 2003